

## DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU 111 SOUTH GEORGE MASON DRIVE ARLINGTON, VA 22204-1382

**NGB-ARE-C** 

1 8 SEP 200

MEMORANDUM FOR The Adjutant General, Indiana Army National Guard (INARNG) ATTN: LTC Jones, Joint Forces Headquaters, 2002 South Holt Road, Indianapolis, IN 46251-4839

SUBJECT: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Review of the Proposed Development and Use of the Muscatatuck Urban Training Center

#### 1. References:

- a. 32 CFR 651, Environmental Analysis of Army Actions, 29 Mar 02.
- b. The National Guard Bureau (NGB) NEPA Handbook, Guidance on Preparing Environmental Documentation for Army National Guard Actions in Compliance with NEPA of 1969, Jun 06.
  - c. Environmental Site Assessment memo to Mr. Ken Parks, 16 March 2008.
- 2. In accordance with procedures established in references 1a and 1b, this EA has been approved by NGB. A copy of the signed Finding of No Significant Impact is enclosed. This completes the appropriate NEPA documentation for this project in accordance with reference 1a. Reference 1c concludes that the ECOP is sufficient, however there are 12 Areas of Concern.
- 3. If project conditions change, review the EA to ensure it adequately addresses the action to be taken. If the EA is invalid, new NEPA documentation must be completed before project initiation.
- 4. The point of contact is MAJ Steve Stadelman, Training Lands Support Officer, at 703-607-7968, DSN 327-7968, or steve.stadelman@us.army.mil.

Encl as

Chief, Environmental
Programs Division

# FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FNSI) INDIANA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

for the
DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF THE MUSCATATUCK URBAN TRAINING CENTER
Butlerville, Jennings County, Indiana

#### Introduction

This Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluates the proposal of the National Guard Bureau (NGB) and the Indiana Army National Guard (INARNG) to develop the Muscatatuck Urban Training Center (MUTC) at the former Muscatatuck State Developmental Center (MSDC) in Butlerville, Indiana. This EA has been developed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and implementing regulations found at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 1500 through Part 1508 (President's Council on Environmental Quality [CEQ], 2002), 32 CFR 651 (Environmental Analysis of Army Actions, Final Rule), and guidance provided in the Army National Guard Manual for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 – Guidance on Preparing Environmental Documentation for Army National Guard Actions in Compliance with NEPA (NGB, 2006).

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to fulfill a training capability shortfall of the INARNG within the State of Indiana and within the region. The INARNG needs the Proposed Action to support its Federal, State, and Community missions. The MUTC would provide a training center for urban operations (UO) and homeland security to serve the wartime mission and combat readiness goals of multiple military units, as well as civilian homeland security and disaster response training needs. The MUTC would function as a sub-installation of the Camp Atterbury Joint Maneuver Training Center (CAJMTC), which has limited urban training facilities. The establishment of the facility will significantly enhance the ability of the INARNG to conduct multi-echelon collective urban operation tasks for squad through battalion sized units.

#### 1. Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action. Under the Proposed Action, the MUTC would serve as the Home Station Combined Arms Training Facility (CACTF) for CAJMTC. The INARNG would renovate existing buildings as needed for UO training, remove three buildings, and construct other necessary buildings to support the UO training center per the specifications of Army Training Circular (TC) 25-8, Training Ranges. Development would follow a two-phased approach. Initial training at and improvements of the MUTC would primarily serve the needs of the INARNG, but would be available to other military and non-military users. The second phase of development would establish the MUTC as an element of the US Army's Combat Training Center Program. Additional site improvements would be made to meet the needs of a broader array of military entities conducting more complex and involved training.

Military forces that would use the MUTC under this proposal include, but are not limited to: the 38th Infantry Division, 76th Infantry Brigade, 81st Troop Command, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, 5th Special Forces Group, US Navy Seal Sniper School, 138th Regiment, 101st Airborne, and numerous other units using CAJMTC. Civilian agencies that may train at MUTC include, but are not limited to: the Indiana Department of Homeland Security, the Counter Terrorism and Security Council for Indiana, the Indiana State Police, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, state emergency management agencies, health departments, fire fighters, and departments of correction.

Alternatives Considered. Four MUTC future development scenarios, or Courses of Action (COA), were developed by the Army and Army National Guard (ARNG) for review and approval by the Vice Chief of Staff, Army (VCSA). The VCSA designated a preferred COA in February 2007. The Proposed Action, with the two-phased approach described above, includes COA-1 and COA-3M. COA-1, establishing the MUTC as the CAJMTC Home Station CACTF, would occur from

approximately the completion of this NEPA process through 30 September 2008. COA-3M, establishing the MUTC as an element of the Combat Training Center Program would begin on approximately 1 October 2008. Both COA are evaluated in this EA.

The two COA not carried forward for full analyses in this EA include COA-2 and COA-4. COA-2 and COA-4 were eliminated from further analysis because they included a specific Joint Services UO training element, a training requirement whose definition is still emerging. With COA-2 the MUTC would operate as a Regional Power Generation Platform (PGP) UO Training Facility, supporting regional Reserve and AC units as part of a "Training Corridor" including Fort Knox and Fort Campbell. With COA-4, the MUTC would be sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense Joint Forces Command (OSD/JFCOM) and operated by the Army.

In addition to the Proposed Action, the INARNG analyzed the No Action Alternative in this EA. Adoption of the No Action Alternative would require the continuation of INARNG training operations as currently conducted, primarily at the CAJMTC. None of the proposed actions at MUTC would be implemented. This alternative is addressed in this EA to provide a baseline to compare impacts associated with the Proposed Action. Although the No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose of or need for the Proposed Action, this comparative analysis within the EA is presented as required under Federal law (NEPA).

## 2. Environmental Analysis

<u>Proposed Action Alternative</u> - Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would result in *net beneficial impacts* to the local socioeconomic environment, onsite infrastructure, and management of contaminated soils at the MUTC. As a result of implementing the Proposed Action Alternative, minor adverse environmental impacts would be anticipated in the form of potential impacts to:

- Air quality from increased mobile emissions and fugitive dust (minor, less than significant without mitigation)
- The noise environment due to increased aircraft and vehicle operations (minor, less than significant without mitigation)
- Geology and Soils from site development and training activities (minor, less than significant without mitigation).

The Proposed Action is not expected to cause significant adverse impacts to the following resource areas, but could require permitting and implementation of specific Best Management Practices (BMPs), depending on the INARNG's final plans for security fence construction and training activities:

- Biological resources
- Water Resources

The Proposed Action is expected to cause significant adverse impacts to the following resource areas:

- Cultural resources due to the removal and/or alteration of historic properties.
- Traffic and Transportation due to increased site usage.

<u>Cumulative Impacts</u> - The long-term potential use of the MUTC by a wider range of participants is still being developed by the INARNG and is not yet ripe for full NEPA analysis. The INARNG is exploring Regional/National use scenarios for the MUTC. Potential partners include the U.S. Army War College; the Department for Homeland Security (DHS); and other Department of Defense (DOD) agencies. However, some reasonably-foreseeable results could be: increased staff, additional training events, increased vehicle (aircraft and ground) movement, additional land acquisition to avoid future encroachment issues and additional onsite construction. Associated direct impacts could include: increased traffic on local

roadways and railways, increased air emissions and noise, and increased training activity in natural areas of the MUTC. Associated indirect impacts could include development of additional support services (such as retail and commercial services) in the vicinity of the MUTC, with associated increases in employment. Implementation of the proposed action would be expected to add positive energy to the local economy and job market. These activities and potential adverse impacts would be subject to future NEPA analysis, which will be conducted by INARNG in coordination with NGB-ARE.

<u>Mitigation and BMPs</u> - Through implementation of the mitigation measures detailed in this EA, each of the above-identified adverse impacts would be reduced to acceptable levels. Mitigation measures and BMPs include:

- Water Resources If wetland and surface water impacts (e.g., cut or fill) can not be avoided during fence and western access route construction, the INARNG will obtain appropriate permits from the USACE and IDEM prior to conducting this work. If impacts to wetlands or surface waters (e.g., jurisdictional and/or isolated) exceed 0.1 acre, mitigation will be required. Jurisdictional wetland and surface water impacts totaling less than 1.0 acre would be covered under the USACE Section 404 Indiana Regional General Permit and the IDEM Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC). Impacts exceeding 1.0 acre will require an individual permit. If isolated wetlands are to be impacted, an isolated wetland permit will be obtained by the INARNG from IDEM. Mitigation ratios will be determined in consultation with the appropriate agencies (e.g., USACE, IDEM, and/or IDNR). The INARNG will comply with all wetland and surface water impact permit requirements for mitigation and monitoring, as a responsibility of the INARNG Environmental Division.
- Biological Resources To avoid incidental take from removal of any occupied Indiana bat roost tree, the USFWS recommends that tree-clearing at MUTC be avoided between 1 April and 1 October (USFWS 2008). If trees need to be removed within this time frame, the INARNG will consult the USFWS. Otherwise, the INARNG will limit all clearing to between 2 October and 31 March. Implementation of this measure will reduce potential adverse impacts to the Indiana Bat to acceptable levels. Should any copperbelly water snakes be observed during clearing, fence installation, or training activities, they will not be harmed and their presence reported to the MUTC environmental staff. Mitigation for the loss of forested non-wetland areas may be required as a result of fence installation and access road construction. The INARNG will determine forest replacement mitigation ratios in consultation with IDNR. A mitigation and monitoring plan, if required, will be developed by the INARNG per IDNR's Planting Guidelines. The INARNG will comply with all requirements of the plan, as established in consultation with IDNR.
- <u>Cultural Resources</u> The INARNG will comply with the September 2006 "Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Among the National Guard Bureau, Military Department of Indiana and the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer for the Mitigation of Adverse Effects to Muscatatuck State Hospital Historic District (Muscatatuck Urban Training Center)".

Further, the INARNG will continue to meet its Section 106 of the NHPA obligations for undertakings not covered by the 2006 MOA and will continue to consult with federally recognized Native American tribes in the event there is a discovery of artifacts or human remains as required under Section 106 of the NHPA, the 2006 MOA, the proposed NHPA Programmatic Agreement (PA), Article 21, Historic Preservation and Archeology (IC 14-21), and IN-DNR-DHPA Permanent Rule: Human Remains, Burial Objects, and Artifacts (312 IAC 22) at the MUTC.

The INARNG will develop a PA between the INARNG, the IN-DNR-DHPA, interested federally recognized Native American tribes (see EA Section 1.5.3), and the NGB. The PA will address the process for evaluating potential adverse effects of future INARNG activities at MUTC on archaeological sites outside the MUTC Historic District boundary

as well as the areas not previously surveyed. The INARNG will ensure that Phase II archeological investigations will be conducted prior to any construction that has the potential to affect an archaeological site that has an undetermined status for National Register eligibility. Future projects at MUTC with the potential to affect archaeological sites include: security fence construction and the access route to the fence, development of the equipment staging area, development of the firefighter training area, drop zones, shoothouse, and the helicopter landing pad. The number of sites investigated will depend on the location of proposed INARNG undertakings. As will be stipulated in the forthcoming PA, if the Phase II investigation determines that a site is eligible for the NRHP, a mitigation plan may be required. This will be determined in consultation with the SHPO and the Tribes. Additionally, because the Phase I archaeological survey was limited to approximately half the MUTC property, activities that would occur in areas not surveyed may require further archaeological studies. These actions will be addressed within the PA. Until the PA has been completed, the INARNG will conduct NHPA Sec. 106 consultation on a case-by-case basis for all undertakings that will occur in areas outside the scope of the 2006 MOA.

Per 312 IAC 22.5-2, no destructive or earth-moving activities would be permitted within 100 feet of the two cemeteries at MUTC without an IN-DNR-DHPA approved cemetery development plan.

Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce identified significant adverse impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- <u>Traffic and Transportation</u> To minimize future traffic related adverse impacts attributable to increased activity at the MUTC under the Proposed Action Alternative, and reduce potential adverse impacts to less than significant levels, the INARNG will:
  - Coordinate convoy movements to avoid peak traffic times. Work with local officials (INDOT, Indiana State Police, Jennings County and the City of North Vernon) to reduce potential traffic impacts resulting from the Proposed Action Alternative. The INARNG has met with, and will continue to coordinate with, these groups to prepare for increased use of the MUTC as a training facility, and to accommodate the level of traffic anticipated therewith. Potential traffic impacts and ways to avoid or reduce them will continue to be a cooperative effort as implementation proceeds.
  - Consult with CSX Transportation regarding train schedules and potential safety issues associated with increased traffic volume at railroad crossings on MUTC access roads.
  - o Notify local officials (INDOT, Indiana State Police, Jennings County and the City of North Vernon) and the public of convoy schedules. Coordinate with local and state officials at least 12 hours in advance of training events when practical. The INARNG will provide these officials with information needed to plan and coordinate traffic, such as the number and types of vehicles expected, routes expected, and the time period. This information could be used in local government public information releases, as appropriate, and will also be posted on the MUTC website. The information will help determine the need to place local law enforcement on notice or on duty for support through congested areas.
  - o Develop traffic control procedures and routes through built up areas to avoid congestion and choke points, in coordination with local authorities (INDOT, Indiana State Police, Jennings County and the City of North Vernon). The INARNG will adopt measures from the May 2005 FHWA Guidance on Coordinating Military Deployments on Roads and Highways into MUTC procedural policies to further reduce transportation impacts. Measures such as night convoy transportation,

time-phasing of convoy movements, traffic signal pre-emption, and local traffic detours will be considered.

Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce identified significant adverse impacts to less-than-significant levels.

# 3. Regulations

The Proposed Action will not violate NEPA, the CEQ Regulations, 32 CFR 651, or any other Federal, state, or local environmental regulations.

# 4. Commitment to Implementation

The NGB and INARNG affirm their commitment to implement this EA in accordance with NEPA. Implementation is dependent on funding. The INARNG and the NGB's Environmental Programs, Training, and Installation Divisions will ensure that adequate funds are requested in future years' budgets to achieve the goals and objectives set forth in this EA.

#### 5. Public Review and Comment

An initial community outreach meeting for this proposal was held on 10 November 2005 at the MUTC during the development of this EA. This meeting was publicized in advance by the INARNG, North Vernon Plain Dealer and Sun, Columbus Republic, and Madison Courier. A total of 82 people attended the meeting, which was an open-house format. Six written comments were received. One commenter requested information on the potential impacts of the MUTC operations on the neighborhood, economics, noise, and traffic. The Jennings County Economic Development (JCED) Corporation and North Vernon Redevelopment Commission have expressed support for the project and indicated they would work with the INARNG concerning local traffic issues. Issues raised by these written comments have been addressed in the EA.

The EA and this Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) were made available for public comment between 14 January and 14 February 2008 following publication of a notice of availability in the North Vernon Sun and the Columbus Republic. INARNG received three comments and prepared written responses for each of the comments.

### 6. Finding of No Significant Impact

18 September 2008

After careful review of the EA, I have concluded that implementation of the Proposed Action would not generate significant controversy or have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. This analysis fulfills the requirements of NEPA and the CEQ Regulations. An Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared, and the NGB is issuing this FNSI.

Date

JEFFRY G. PHILLIPS Colonel, US Army Chief, Environmental Programs Division